

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed on November 15, 2006, claims 1 to 21 are amended and the Applicant would like to respectfully requests that the patent application be reconsidered and allowed.

An item-by-item response to Examiner's objections or rejections is provided in the followings:

1. *Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103:*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rivette et al., US 5,991,780 A priority filed **11/19/1993** in view of Krause et al., US 5,625,827 filed 12/23/1994.

According to the Examiner, the file name as that disclosed in Krause is well known in the art is a textual description of the FILE, (emphasis is added by the Applicant). In contrast to the claims in the Amendment submitted on May 15, 2007, the textual descriptions are DIRECTLY of the "graphic element". The linking as emphasized by this invention is to link the graphic element with the textual descriptions that describe and explain the graphic element. The textual descriptions are obvious much more than just a file name. The Applicant would like to respectfully submit that a "file name" is not a "textual description".

In order to further distinguish this invention from Revette and Krause, the claims are further amended to the processes involve only a single file for a single document. Based on the amendment, the Applicant would like to direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that the disclosures of Krause actually teaches away the invention as now directed by the amended claims. The disclosures of Krause require the document management and process program, typically a software system, to manage and handle multiple computer files. The processes and data handling procedures are much more complicated than the processes as now involve for managing and processing a single file for a single document. A person of ordinary skill in the art when reviewing the processes of Krause is unlikely motivated to apply the methods disclosed there to combine with Krause. The amended claims are directed to a single file containing a single document

such that the processor is not required to process multiple files.

Specifically, claim 19 is amended to direct to a method for reading and managing a single document having textual descriptions and at least a drawing consisted of graphic elements designated with an graphic element designation associated with a naming term in one of said textual descriptions of said single document incorporated in a single processor-recognizable file, comprising:

employing a display means for displaying said drawing with said naming term included in said textual description for displaying immediately next to said graphic element whereby a document reviewer can directly and simultaneously view and associate said naming term to said graphic element without requiring a processor to process multiple files.

With the added elements, the amended claims have more limited scopes and further distinguish from Revette and Krause with distinguishing advantages of easier to review/process with simplified processes incorporated in a software system that neither Revette or Krause has ever suggested or motivated. For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn for the amended claims.

For the above reasons, the claims 1-21 would be non-obvious in view of the cited prior art references.

With the claims as now presented and the reasons provided above, the applicant hereby respectfully requests that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 103 be withdrawn and the present application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
Bo-In Lin.

By



Bo-In Lin -- Attorney, Registration No. 33,948
13445 Mandoli Drive, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(650) 949-0418 (Tel), (650) 949-4118 (Fax)